arXiv:1606.01715v1 [math.NT] 6 Jun 2016

On Dirichlet Products Evaluated at Fibonacci Numbers

Uwe Stroinski*

June 7, 2016

Abstract

In this work we discuss sums of the form $\sum_{n\leq x}(f*g)(a_n)$ with a_n being the n–th Fibonacci number. As first applications of the results we get a representation of Fibonacci numbers in terms of Euler's φ–function, an upper bound on the number of primitive prime divisors and a non–trivial fixed point $h(m)=\sum_{\alpha(n)=m}h(n)$, where $\alpha(n)$ is the least index m such that $n|a_m$.

1 Introduction

Let a_n denote the Fibonacci sequence, thus a_n is recursively given by $a_0 := 0, a_1 := 1$ and $a_{n+1} := a_n + a_{n-1}$ for $n \geq 1$. In the following we consider a version of the well–known formula from multiplicative number theory

$$\sum_{n\leq x}(f*g)(n)=\sum_{n\leq x}f(n)G\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)=\sum_{n\leq x}g(n)F\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)$$

where $G(x) := \sum_{n\leq x}g(n)$ and $F(x) := \sum_{n\leq x}f(n)$ adapted to Dirichlet products evaluated at Fibonacci numbers.

*E-mail address: uwst@fa.uni-tuebingen.de. I thank Rainer Nagel for his valuable support and the Tuebingen Functional Analysis group for their kind hospitality.

Theorem 1. Let f and g be arithmetic functions and let $x \geq 1$ be real. Then we have

$$\sum_{n\leq x}(f*g)(a_n) = \sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} f(n) \sum_{d\leq \frac{x}{\alpha(n)}} g\left(\frac{a_{d\cdot\alpha(n)}}{n}\right) = \sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} g(n) \sum_{d\leq \frac{x}{\alpha(n)}} f\left(\frac{a_{d\cdot\alpha(n)}}{n}\right).$$

Here α denotes the dual of the Fibonacci sequence (sometimes called the rank of apparition) and is defined as

$$\alpha(n) := \min\{m \in \mathbb{N} : n|a_m\},$$

the smallest integer m such that $n|a_m$.

I discuss the relation of this theorem to known results of Matiyasevich and Guy [13] as well as results of Kiss [9] and give some further applications. Among them are a new representation of Fibonacci numbers in terms of Euler's φ–function, an upper bound for the number of primitive prime factors in the Fibonacci sequence and explicit representations of some related Euler products.

Let me fix some notation. Define

$$e_n := \max\{m \in \mathbb{N} : n^m|a_{\alpha(n)}\},$$

the maximal power of n that still divides $a_{\alpha(n)}$. The integer part of a real number x is $\lfloor x \rfloor$ and the fractional part is $\{x\}$. Therefore $x = \lfloor x \rfloor + \{x\}$. Define the golden ratio $r := \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ as well as $s := \frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$ and remember Binet's formula $a_n = \frac{r^n - s^n}{\sqrt{5}}$. An arithmetic function is a function from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{C}$. The sum $\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} f(n)$ means $\sum_{n:\ \substack{1\leq n \\ \alpha(n)\leq x}} f(n)$, that is we sum over all $n \geq 1$ with $\alpha(n) \leq x$. These sums are finite since for $n > a_{\lfloor x \rfloor}$ one has $\alpha(n) > \lfloor x \rfloor$. In what follows p is always a prime number and $\sum_{\alpha(p)\leq x} f(p)$ denotes the sum of $f(p)$ over all primes that divide at least one Fibonacci number a_n with $n \leq x$.

For an arithmetic function f define its α–contraction f_α as

$$f_\alpha(n) := \sum_{m:\alpha(m)=n} f(m)$$

with the empty sum defined to be zero $f_\alpha(2) := 0$. Set

$$T_{f,\alpha}(x) := \sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} f(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\alpha(n)} \right\rfloor$$

and

$$S_{f,\alpha}(x) := \sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} f(n).$$

Observe that this implies $S_{f,\alpha}(x) = \sum_{n\leq x} f_\alpha(n)$. Remember, that a standard result now yields $T_{f,\alpha}(x) = \sum_{n\leq x} S_{f,\alpha}\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)$ and by Moebius inversion we obtain $S_{f,\alpha}(x) = \sum_{n\leq x} \mu(n) T_{f,\alpha}\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)$. We keep the α in the index since most of the results hold with exactly the same proofs for more general strong divisibility sequences. Since we focus on Fibonacci numbers, we do not feel the need to present each preliminary result in most general form. Especially since it is Fibonacci numbers that have recently received attention (eg. a polymath proposal concerning Littlewood's conjecture by Gowers [6]) and since the problems are already considered hard for this special case (cf. eg. Sarnak [15] on the number of Fibonacci primes or Granville [7] on the existence of Wall–Sun–Sun primes).

2 The proof of Theorem 1

In the next lemma we collect some results on the dual sequence.

Lemma 2. Let $0 < n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and p be prime, then we have

- duality: $n|a_m$ if and only if $\alpha(n)|m$,
- $\alpha(p^n) = p^{n-e_p}\alpha(p)$ for odd primes p with $n > e_p$ and
- $\alpha(2) = 3, \alpha(4) = 6$ and $\alpha(2^n) = 3 \cdot 2^{n-2}$ for $n \geq 3$.

The proof of this lemma is well–known and can be found e.g in Halton [8].

Let us now prove Theorem 1.

Proof. Let $1 \leq x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n = \lfloor x \rfloor$. For each x we consider a table with a_n rows and n columns. Let $1 \leq d \leq a_n$ and fill position (d, n) with $f(d)g\left(\frac{a_n}{d}\right)$ if $\alpha(d)|n$ and with zero otherwise. This table is depicted in Figure 1.

Double counting yields

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d:\alpha(d)|n} f(d) g\left(\frac{a_n}{d}\right) = \sum_{n \leq a_x} f(n) \sum_{d \leq x/\alpha(n)} g\left(\frac{a_{d \cdot \alpha(n)}}{n}\right).$$

For $\alpha(n) > x$ we have $\sum_{d \leq x/\alpha(n)} g\left(\frac{a_{d \cdot \alpha(n)}}{n}\right) = 0$ and therefore the summation in the right sum can be restricted to those $n \leq a_x$ with $\alpha(n) \leq x$ and since $n > a_x$ implies $\alpha(n) > x$ it suffices to sum over those n with $\alpha(n) \leq x$. In the left sum we observe that $d|a_n$ if and only if $\alpha(d)|n$. That proves the first equality. The second equality in the theorem follows from $f * g = g * f$. $\diamondsuit$

The applicability of Theorem 1 depends on the ability to control sums like $\sum_{d \leq \frac{x}{\alpha(n)}} g\left(\frac{a_{d \cdot \alpha(n)}}{n}\right)$. In general, this is hard. However, one frequently considers functions g satisfying additional assumptions.

Corollary 3. Let f and g be arithmetic functions and let g be completely multiplicative. Then we have

$$(f * g)(a_n) = g(a_n) \left(1 * \left(\frac{f}{g}\right)_\alpha\right)(n).$$

If additionally $g(n) = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(1 * f)(a_n) = (1 * f_\alpha)(n).$$

n	1	2	3	4	5	6	$\dots$	n	
$d \backslash a_n$	1	1	2	3	5	8	$\dots$	a_n	$\sum$
1	$f(1)g\left(\frac{1}{1}\right)$	$f(1)g\left(\frac{1}{1}\right)$	$f(1)g\left(\frac{2}{1}\right)$	$f(1)g\left(\frac{3}{1}\right)$	$f(1)g\left(\frac{5}{1}\right)$	$f(1)g\left(\frac{8}{1}\right)$	$\cdots$	$f(1)g\left(\frac{a_n}{1}\right)$	$f(1)\sum_{d\leq n/\alpha(1)} g\left(\frac{a_{d\cdot\alpha(1)}}{1}\right)$
2	0	0	$f(2)g\left(\frac{2}{2}\right)$	0	0	$f(2)g\left(\frac{8}{2}\right)$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$f(2)\sum_{d\leq n/\alpha(2)} g\left(\frac{a_{d\cdot\alpha(2)}}{2}\right)$
3	0	0	0	$f(3)g\left(\frac{3}{3}\right)$	0	0	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$f(3)\sum_{d\leq n/\alpha(3)} g\left(\frac{a_{d\cdot\alpha(3)}}{3}\right)$
4	0	0	0	0	0	$f(4)g\left(\frac{8}{4}\right)$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$f(4)\sum_{d\leq n/\alpha(4)} g\left(\frac{a_{d\cdot\alpha(4)}}{4}\right)$
5	0	0	0	0	$f(5)g\left(\frac{5}{5}\right)$	0	$\dots$	$\dots$	$f(5)\sum_{d\leq n/\alpha(5)} g\left(\frac{a_{d\cdot\alpha(5)}}{5}\right)$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
a_n	0	0	0	0	0	0	$\dots$	$f(a_n)g\left(\frac{a_n}{a_n}\right)$	$f(a_n)\sum_{d\leq n/\alpha(a_n)} g\left(\frac{a_{d\cdot\alpha(a_n)}}{a_n}\right)$
$\sum$	$\sum_{\alpha(d)\mid 1} f(1)g\left(\frac{1}{d}\right)$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\sum_{\alpha(d)\mid n} f(d)g\left(\frac{a_n}{d}\right)$	

Figure 1: The double counting argument

Proof. By Theorem 1 we have

$$\sum_{n\le x}(f*g)(a_n) \;=\; \sum_{\alpha(n)\le x} f(n) \sum_{d\le \frac{x}{\alpha(n)}} g\left(\frac{a_{d\cdot\alpha(n)}}{n}\right).$$

Since g is completely multiplicative, this equals

$$= \sum_{d,n:d\cdot\alpha(n)\le x} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} g(a_{d\cdot\alpha(n)}).$$

We rearrange the sum

$$= \sum_{d,k:d\cdot k\le x} g(a_{d\cdot k}) \sum_{n:\alpha(n)=k} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)}$$

and use the definition of α–contraction

$$= \sum_{d,k:d\cdot k\le x} g(a_{d\cdot k}) \left(\frac{f}{g}\right)_\alpha (k).$$

Introducing a new index $n = d\cdot k$ yields

$$= \sum_{n\le x} g(a_n) \sum_{k|n} \left(\frac{f}{g}\right)_\alpha (k)$$

and, by the definition of the Dirichlet product, we get

$$\sum_{n\le x}(f*g)(a_n) \;=\; \sum_{n\le x} g(a_n) \left(1 * \left(\frac{f}{g}\right)_\alpha\right)(n).$$

These sums are equal for all $x\in\mathbb{R}$ and therefore

$$(f*g)(a_n) = g(a_n)\left(1*\left(\frac{f}{g}\right)_\alpha\right)(n)$$

for $n\in\mathbb{N}$. That proves the first assertion. The second assertion is an immediate consequence. $\diamondsuit$

3 Relation to existing results

In this section we show how the above connects to existing work (e.g. Matiyasevich and Guy [13] or Kiss [9]) and prepare the next steps.

Corollary 4. For $x \geq 1$ we have

$$\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} \Lambda(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\alpha(n)} \right\rfloor = \frac{\log r}{2} \lfloor x \rfloor^2 + \frac{\log \frac{r}{5}}{2} \lfloor x \rfloor + \sum_{n \leq x} \log \left(1 - \frac{(-1)^n}{r^{2n}} \right).$$

Note that

$$\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} \Lambda(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\alpha(n)} \right\rfloor = \log \prod_{n \leq x} a_n.$$

Proof. By Theorem 1 one has $\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} \Lambda(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\alpha(n)} \right\rfloor = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|a_n} \Lambda(d)$ and since $\sum_{d|n} \Lambda(d) = \log n$ this yields $\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} \Lambda(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\alpha(n)} \right\rfloor = \log \prod_{n \leq x} a_n$. Binet's formula together with $sr = -1$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left[\prod_{n \leq x} a_n \right] &= \log \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \right)^{\lfloor x \rfloor} \prod_{n \leq x} r^n \prod_{n \leq x} 1 - \frac{s^n}{r^n} \right] \\ &= \log \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \right)^{\lfloor x \rfloor} \prod_{n \leq x} r^n \prod_{n \leq x} 1 - \frac{(-1)^n}{r^{2n}} \right] \\ &= \frac{\log r}{2} \lfloor x \rfloor^2 + \frac{\log \frac{r}{5}}{2} \lfloor x \rfloor + \sum_{n \leq x} \log \left(1 - \frac{(-1)^n}{r^{2n}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which proves the corollary. ♢

Observe that

$$c := \lim_{x \to \infty} \sum_{n \leq x} \log \left(1 - \frac{(-1)^n}{r^{2n}} \right)$$

exists with approximately $c = 0.2043618834....$

The next result delivers the exact asymptotic growth of the summatory (in the sense of this paper) von Mangoldt function.

Corollary 5. We have

$$\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} \Lambda(n) = \frac{3\log r}{\pi^2} x^2 + O(x\log x).$$

Note that

$$\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} \Lambda(n) = \log \operatorname{lcm}(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{\lfloor x \rfloor}).$$

Proof. With the notations of the previous section we obtain for $f = \Lambda$ and $c_x := \sum_{n\leq x} \log\left(1 - \frac{(-1)^n}{r^{2n}}\right)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\Lambda,\alpha}(x) &= \sum_{n\leq x} \mu(n) T_{\Lambda,\alpha}\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \\ &= \frac{\log r}{2} \sum_{n\leq x} \mu(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{n} \right\rfloor^2 + \frac{\log \frac{r}{5}}{2} \sum_{n\leq x} \mu(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{n} \right\rfloor + c_x \sum_{n\leq x} \mu(n) \\ &= \frac{\log r}{2} \sum_{n\leq x} \mu(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{n} \right\rfloor^2 + c_x \sum_{n\leq x} \mu(n) + \frac{\log \frac{r}{5}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The sum $\sum_{n\leq x} \mu(n)$ trivially is $O(x)$ and it is an exercise to show that

$$\sum_{n\leq x} \mu(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{n} \right\rfloor^2 = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} x^2 + O(x\log x).$$

Since $\zeta(2) = \frac{\pi^2}{6}$ this finishes the proof. ♢

By considering the quotient of the quantities in Corollary 4 and Corollary 5 and taking limits the formula for π in [13] follows. These ideas can be generalized to get representations for $\zeta(k)$ for values k not necessarily 2 (cf. Akiyama [1]).

Let us further investigate the summatory (in the sense of this paper) von Mangoldt function. To that purpose we keep in mind that 2 is the exception to $\alpha(p^n) = p^{n-e_p}\alpha(p)$ with $n > e_p$ and that there might exist primes with

$e_p > 1$ (cf. eg. Wall [18] as well as Sun and Sun [17]). We get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\alpha(n)\le x}\Lambda(n) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{\alpha(p^n)\le x}\log p \\ &= \sum_{\alpha(p)\le x}\sum_{n=1}^{e_p}\log p + \sum_{\substack{2<p,e_p<n\\ p^{n-e_p}\alpha(p)\le x}}\log p + \log 2\sum_{1<n,\alpha(2^n)\le x}1\end{aligned}$$

and conclude for $x \ge 1$

$$\sum_{\alpha(n)\le x}\Lambda(n) - \sum_{\alpha(p)\le x} e_p\log p = \sum_{\substack{2<p,e_p<n\\ p^{n-e_p}\alpha(p)\le x}}\log p + O(\log x).$$

Since in the right sum $n > e_p$ we have $p \le x$ and thus

$$\sum_{\substack{2<p,e_p<n\\ p^{n-e_p}\alpha(p)\le x}}\log p \le \sum_{p^n\le x}\log p = \sum_{n\le x}\Lambda(n)$$

which is known to be $O(x)$. Thus

$$\sum_{\alpha(n)\le x}\Lambda(n) - \sum_{\alpha(p)\le x} e_p\log p = O(x)$$

and we get a special case of a result due to Kiss [9].

Corollary 6. We have

$$\sum_{\alpha(p)\le x} e_p\log p = \frac{3\log r}{\pi^2}x^2 + O(x\log x).$$

4 An upper bound for the number of primitive primes

A primitive prime factor of a_n is a prime p that divides a_n but does not divide a_m for $1 \leq m \leq n-1$. The existence of primitive prime divisors for Lucas numbers with positive discriminant and suffciently large index (with Fibonacci numbers as a special case) is ensured by a result of Lucas [12] that was later considerably generalized (cf. Carmichael [4], Schinzel [16], Bilu, Hanrot and Voutier [2]).

Once existence is established it is natural to ask how many primitive prime factors there are. We define

$$\pi_\alpha(x) := \sum_{\alpha(p) \leq x} 1$$

as the number of primitive prime factors of Fibonacci numbers up to index $\lfloor x \rfloor$ and go on to show how Corollary 5 can be used to get an upper bound complementing the existence results.

Theorem 7. We have

$$\limsup_{x \to \infty} \frac{\log x}{x^2} \pi_\alpha(x) \leq \frac{3 \log r}{2\pi^2}.$$

Proof. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 2$ and write π_α as follows

$$\pi_\alpha(x) \quad = \sum_{p \leq x^{2-\varepsilon} : \alpha(p) \leq x} 1 + \sum_{p > x^{2-\varepsilon} : \alpha(p) \leq x} 1.$$

The first sum $\sum_{p \leq x^{2-\varepsilon} : \alpha(p) < x} 1$ can be estimated by $x^{2-\varepsilon}$. To get an estimate for the second sum let $\{p_1, \ldots, p_t\} := \{x^{2-\varepsilon} < p \leq a_{\lfloor x \rfloor} : \alpha(p) \leq x\}$. Then $\prod_{n=1}^{t} p_n \leq \operatorname{lcm}_{n=1}^{x} a_n$. Let s be such that $(x^{2-\varepsilon})^s = \operatorname{lcm}_{n=1}^{x} a_n$. Since $x^{2-\varepsilon} < p_i$

for $1 \leq i \leq t$ we get $t \leq s$ and thus

$$\left(x^{2-\varepsilon}\right)^t \leq \operatorname{lcm}_{n=1}^{x} a_n.$$

Therefore

$$\pi_\alpha(x) \leq x^{2-\varepsilon} + \frac{\log\left(\operatorname{lcm}_{n=1}^{x} a_n\right)}{(2-\varepsilon)\log x}$$

and with Corollary 5 we get

$$\pi_\alpha(x) \leq x^{2-\varepsilon} + \frac{3\log r}{(2-\varepsilon)\pi^2}\frac{x^2}{\log x}.$$

This inequality is valid for any $0 < \varepsilon < 2$ and therefore finished the proof of the theorem. ♢

Let me give an alternative proof of this theorem.

Proof. Let $d(n)$ denote the number of divisors of n. We have

$$d\left(\prod_{\alpha(p)\leq x} p^{e(p)}\right) = \prod_{\alpha(p)\leq x} (1+e(p))$$

and we know $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log d(n)\log\log n}{\log n} = \log 2$. Therefore Corollary 5 implies

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{\alpha(p)\leq x} \log(1+e(p)) 2\log x}{\frac{3\log r}{\pi^2}x^2} \leq \log 2$$

and thus

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{\log x}{x^2} \sum_{\alpha(p)\leq x} \log(1+e(p)) \leq \frac{3\log r}{2\pi^2}\log 2.$$

This implies

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{\log x}{x^2}\pi_\alpha(x) \leq \frac{3\log r}{2\pi^2}$$

and thus completes the proof. ♢

There is still a gap between the lower bounds indicated by Carmichael's

theorem and the upper bound given above. One might wonder why not to directly prove a prime number theorem giving the exact asymptotics. The difficulty here stems from the fact that current proofs of the prime number theorem make use of $\sum_{n\leq x}\Lambda(n) \sim \sum_{p\leq x}\log p$ in a crucial way. In our situation we have $\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x}\Lambda(n) \sim \sum_{\alpha(p)\leq x} e_p \log p$ and $\sum_{\alpha(p)\leq x}\log\alpha(p) = \pi_\alpha(x)\log x - \int_1^x \frac{\pi_\alpha(t)}{t}dt$ by partial summation. However, in the light of the above estimate, $|\sum_{\alpha(p)\leq x} e_p\log p - \sum_{\alpha(p)\leq x}\log\alpha(p)| = |\sum_{\alpha(p)\leq x}\log\frac{p^{e_p}}{\alpha(p^{e_p})}|$ is not asymptotically zero. The connection of the growth of $\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x}\Lambda(n)$ and the growth of $\pi_\alpha(x)$ is not as tight as in the situation of the prime number theorem.

5 A representation of Fibonacci numbers

Let φ be Euler's totient function. Since $\sum_{d|n}\varphi(d) = n$ we obtain from Theorem 1 that

$$\sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x}\varphi(n)\left\lfloor\frac{x}{\alpha(n)}\right\rfloor = \sum_{n\leq x} a_n = a_{\lfloor x\rfloor+2} - 1$$

where the last equality follows from an elementary induction argument.

Note that this can be used as an alternative definition of the Fibonacci numbers. To that purpose set $a_1 := 1$ and define

$$a_{x+2} := 1 + \sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x}\varphi(n)\left\lfloor\frac{x}{\alpha(n)}\right\rfloor$$

for $x \geq 0$. In that case α is also defined recursively, the sum is taken over all numbers dividing at least one a_n with $n \leq x$.

Euler's totient function appears in many places in number theory. A connection to Fibonacci numbers like the above seems to be new.

6 Iterating α–contractions of Moebius μ

In this section section we will repeatedly apply α–contraction starting with the Moebius μ function. As a result we will get a non–trivial fixed point and a non–trivial kernel element of α–contraction considered as linear operator on arithmetic functions.

We know that $\sum_{d|n} \mu(d) = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{n} \right\rfloor$. This expression is equal to 1 if $n = 1$ and equal to 0 else. Since $a_1 = a_2 = 1 < a_n$ for $n > 2$ we can evaluate $\sum_{n \leq x} \left\lfloor \frac{1}{a_n} \right\rfloor$ and if we now apply Theorem 1 we obtain

$$T_{\mu,\alpha}(x) = \sum_{\alpha(n) \leq x} \mu(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\alpha(n)} \right\rfloor \quad = \quad \begin{cases} 1, & 1 \leq x < 2, \\ 2, & 2 \leq x. \end{cases}$$

Moebius inversion yields

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mu,\alpha}(x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) T_{\mu,\alpha}\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{n \leq \frac{x}{2}} \mu(n) + \sum_{\frac{x}{2} < n \leq x} \mu(n) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) + \sum_{n \leq \frac{x}{2}} \mu(n) \end{aligned}$$

We set $M(x) := \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)$ and finally arrive at

$$S_{\mu,\alpha}(x) = M(x) + M\left(\frac{x}{2}\right).$$

We use that to get an explicit representation of μ_α.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_\alpha(m) &= \sum_{\alpha(n)=m} \mu(n) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha(n)\le m} \mu(n) - \sum_{\alpha(n)\le m-1} \mu(n) \\
&= S_{\mu,\alpha}(n) - S_{\mu,\alpha}(n-1) \\
&= M(n) - M(n-1) + M\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) - M\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right) \\
&= \mu(n) + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \text{ even}, \\ 0, & n \text{ odd}. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\mu_\alpha(n) = \begin{cases} \mu(n), & \text{for } n \equiv 1,3 \mod 4 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & \text{for } n \equiv 0 \mod 4 \\ 0, & \text{for } n \equiv 2 \mod 4 \end{cases}$$

This function is multiplicative.

Define $\mu_{\alpha^{m+1}} := (\mu_{\alpha^m})_\alpha$ for $m \ge 1$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{\mu_\alpha,\alpha}(x) &= \sum_{\alpha(n)\le x} \mu_\alpha(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\alpha(n)} \right\rfloor \\
&= \sum_{\alpha(n)\le x} (1 * \mu_\alpha)(a_n) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha(n)\le x} \left\lfloor \frac{1}{a_{a_n}} \right\rfloor \\
&= \begin{cases} 1, & n < 2, \\ 2, & n < 3, \\ 3, & n \ge 3. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mu_\alpha,\alpha}(x) &= \sum_{n\le x}\mu(n)T_{\mu_\alpha,\alpha}\left(\frac{x}{n}\right) \\ &= 3\sum_{n\le x/3}\mu(n)+2\sum_{x/3<n\le x/2}\mu(n)+\sum_{x/2<n\le x}\mu(n) \\ &= M(x)+M\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)+M\left(\frac{x}{3}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\alpha^2}(n) &= M(n)-M(n-1)+M\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)-M\left(\frac{x-1}{2}\right)+M\left(\frac{x}{3}\right)-M\left(\frac{x-1}{3}\right) \\ &= \mu(n)+\begin{cases}\mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n\equiv 0 \mod 2,\\ 0, & n\not\equiv 0 \mod 2,\end{cases}+\begin{cases}\mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n\equiv 0 \mod 3,\\ 0, & n\not\equiv 0 \mod 3,\end{cases} \\ &= \mu(n)+\begin{cases}\mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n\equiv 0 \mod 6,\\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n\equiv 2,4 \mod 6,\\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n\equiv 3 \mod 6.\end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$-1=\mu_{\alpha^2}(6)\neq\mu_{\alpha^2}(2)\mu_{\alpha^2}(3)=0\cdot 0$$

we have μ_{α^2} is not multiplicative.

We apply α–contraction one last time and get

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu_{\alpha^2},\alpha}(x) &= \sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} \mu_{\alpha^2}(n) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\alpha(n)} \right\rfloor \\ &= \sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} (1 * \mu_{\alpha^2})(a_n) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha(n)\leq x} \left\lfloor \frac{1}{a_{a_{a_n}}} \right\rfloor \\ &= \begin{cases} 1, & n < 2, \\ 2, & n < 3, \\ 3, & n < 4, \\ 4, & n \geq 4. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

With a similar argument as above we get

$$S_{\mu_{\alpha^2},\alpha}(x) = M(x) + M\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) + M\left(\frac{x}{3}\right) + M\left(\frac{x}{4}\right)$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\alpha^3}(n) &= \mu(n) + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ 0, & n \not\equiv 0 \mod 2 \end{cases} + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 3 \\ 0, & n \not\equiv 0 \mod 3 \end{cases} \\ &\quad + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 4 \\ 0, & n \not\equiv 0 \mod 4 \end{cases} \\ &= \mu(n) + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 2, 10 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 3, 9 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 4, 8 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 6 \mod 12 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \begin{cases}
\mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n\equiv 0 \mod 12\\
\mu(n)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n\equiv 2,10 \mod 12\\
\mu(n)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n\equiv 3,9 \mod 12\\
\mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n\equiv 4,8 \mod 12\\
\mu(n)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n\equiv 6 \mod 12\\
\mu(n), & n\equiv 1,5,7,11 \mod 12
\end{cases}\\
&= \begin{cases}
\mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n\equiv 0 \mod 12\\
0, & n\equiv 2,10 \mod 12\\
\mu(n)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n\equiv 3,9 \mod 12\\
\mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n\equiv 4,8 \mod 12\\
\mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n\equiv 6 \mod 12\\
\mu(n), & n\equiv 1,5,7,11 \mod 12
\end{cases}\\
&= \begin{cases}
\mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n\equiv 0,4,8 \mod 12\\
0, & n\equiv 2,10 \mod 12\\
\mu(n)+\mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n\equiv 3,9 \mod 12\\
\mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n\equiv 6 \mod 12\\
\mu(n), & n\equiv 1,5,7,11 \mod 12
\end{cases}\\
&= 1,0,0,0,-1,-1,-1,-1,-1,0,-1,0,\\
&\quad -1,0,0,0,-1,1,-1,0,0,0,-1,1,\ldots
\end{aligned}
$$

Again we check for multiplicativity and obtain

$$-1 = \mu_{\alpha^3}(6) \neq \mu_{\alpha^3}(2)\mu_{\alpha^3}(3) = 0 \cdot 0$$

and therefore μ_{α^3} is not multiplicative.

Since $\left\lfloor \frac{1}{a_{a_{a_n}}} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{a_{a_{a_n}}} \right\rfloor$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the remarkable identity

$$\sum_{\alpha(d)=n} \mu_{\alpha^3}(d) = \mu_{\alpha^3}(n)$$

for $1 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies $\mu_{\alpha^m} = \mu_{\alpha^3}$ for $m \geq 3$.

The above fixed point property and linearity of α–contraction yields

$$(\mu_{\alpha^3} - \mu_{\alpha^2})_\alpha = \mu_{\alpha^4} - \mu_{\alpha^3} = 0$$

and thus $\Delta_{23} := \mu_{\alpha^2} - \mu_{\alpha^3}$ is in the kernel of α–contraction. Let us find an explicit representation for Δ_{23}.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{23}(n) &= \mu(n) + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 6 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 2,4 \mod 6 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 3 \mod 6 \end{cases} \\
&\quad - \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 0,4,8 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 2,10 \mod 12 \\ \mu(n) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 3,9 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 6 \mod 12 \\ \mu(n), & n \equiv 1,5,7,11 \mod 12 \end{cases} \\
&= \mu(n) + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 0,6 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 2,4,8,10 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 3,9 \mod 12 \end{cases} \\
&\quad - \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 0,4,8 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 2,10 \mod 12 \\ \mu(n) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 3,9 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right), & n \equiv 6 \mod 12 \\ \mu(n), & n \equiv 1,5,7,11 \mod 12 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \mu(n) - \mu\left(\frac{n}{3}\right) - \mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 12 \\ \mu(n) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 2 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 3,9 \mod 12 \\ \mu(n) - \mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 4,8 \mod 12 \\ \mu(n) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 6 \mod 12 \\ \mu(n) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 10 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 1,5,7,11 \mod 12 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \begin{cases} -\mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 2 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 3,9 \mod 12 \\ -\mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 4,8 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 6 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 10 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 1,5,7,11 \mod 12 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} -\mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 0,4,8 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \equiv 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10,11 \mod 12 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} -\mu\left(\frac{n}{4}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 4 \\ 0, & n \equiv 1,2,3 \mod 4 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $f_\alpha(2) = 0$ we know that α–contraction as a linear operator on its natural domain, the arithmetic functions, is not surjective. With Δ_{23} as a nontrivial kernel element, α–contraction is not injective either.

7 The α–contraction of Liouville λ

In this section we will compute λ_α. To that purpose we need a result of Cohn [5] and independently by Wyler [19] ensuring that the only square Fibonacci numbers are $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ and $a_{12} = 144$. This result was later generalized in various directions cf. eg. London and Finkelstein [11], Lagarias and Weissel [10], Ribenboim [14] and Bilu, Hanrot and Voutier [2].

As in the examples above we find that $1 * \lambda$ is the characteristic function of some set, namely the set of square numbers. Using the characterisation of

square Fibonacci numbers we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_\alpha(n) &= M(n) - M(n-1) + M\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) - M\left(\frac{x-1}{2}\right) + M\left(\frac{x}{12}\right) - M\left(\frac{x-1}{12}\right) \\
&= \mu(n) + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ 0, & n \not\equiv 0 \mod 2 \end{cases} + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{12}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 12 \\ 0, & n \not\equiv 0 \mod 12 \end{cases} \\
&= \mu(n) + \begin{cases} \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{12}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 2,4,6,8,10 \mod 12 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \mu(n), & n \equiv 1,3,5,7,9,11 \mod 12 \\ \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{12}\right), & n \equiv 0 \mod 12 \\ \mu(n) + \mu\left(\frac{n}{2}\right), & n \equiv 2,4,6,8,10 \mod 12 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$2 = \lambda_\alpha(12) \neq \lambda_\alpha(4)\lambda_\alpha(3) = 1$$

and thus λ_α is not multiplicative.

8 Euler products of α–contractions

In general α–contractions are not multiplicative and thus Euler products might be hard to find. However, in the cases considered we can exploit Corollary 3 and obtain e.g.

$$\zeta(s)\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\lambda_\alpha(n)}{n^s} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(1*\lambda)(a_n)}{n^s} = 1 + 2^{-s} + 12^{-s}$$

for $s \in \mathbb{C}$ (as analytic extensions). Therefore

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\lambda_\alpha(n)}{n^s} = (1 + 2^{-s} + 12^{-s})\prod_p(1 - p^{-s})$$

for $s = \sigma + it$ with real part $\sigma > 1$. With a similar argument we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_\alpha(n)}{n^s} &= (1 - 4^{-s}) \prod_{p>2} (1 - p^{-s}), \\
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\alpha^2}(n)}{n^s} &= (1 + 2^{-s} + 3^{-s}) \prod_{p} (1 - p^{-s}), \\
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\alpha^3}(n)}{n^s} &= (1 + 2^{-s} + 3^{-s} + 4^{-s}) \prod_{p} (1 - p^{-s})
\end{aligned}$$

again for $s = \sigma + it$ with real part $\sigma > 1$.

References

[1] S. Akiyama, A New Type of Inclusion Exclusion Principle for Sequences and Asymptotic Formulas for $\zeta(k)$, J. Num. Th. **45** (1993), 200–214.

[2] Y. Bilu, G. Hanrot and P. Voutier, Existence of primitive divisors of Lucas and Lehmer numbers, J. Reine angew. Math. **539** (2001), 75–122.

[3] Y. Bugeaud, M. Mignotte and S. Siksek, Classical and modular approaches to exponential Diophantine equations I. Fibonacci and Lucas perfect powers, Annals of Mathematics **163** (2006), 969–1018.

[4] R. D. Carmichael, On the numerical factors of the arithmetic forms $a^n + b^n$, Annals of Mathematics **15 (1/4)** (1913), 30–70.

[5] J. H. E. Cohn, On square Fibonacci numbers, J. London Math. Soc. **39** (1964), 537–540.

[6] T. Gowers, Problems related to Littlewood's conjecture, (2009), `https://gowers.wordpress.com/2009/11/17/problems-related-to-littlewoods-conj`

[7] A. Granville, Primitive prime factors in second–order linear recurrence sequences, Acta Arithmetica **155** (2012), 431–452.

[8] J. Halton, On the divisibility properties of Fibonacci numbers, Fibonacci Quart. **4.3** (1966), 217–240.

[9] P. Kiss, Primitive divisors of Lucas numbers, Applications of Fibonacci Numbers, Kluwer Acad. Press (1988), 29–38.

[10] J. C. Lagarias, D. P. Weissel, Fibonacci and Lucas Cubes, The Fibonacci Quarterly **19** (1981), 39–43.

[11] H. London, R. Finkelstein, On Fibonacci and Lucas Numbers Which are Perfect Powers, The Fibonacci Quarterly **7** (1969), 476–481, 487.

[12] E. Lucas. Théorie des fonctions numériques simplement périodiques, American J. Math. **1** (1878), 184–240, 289–321.

[13] Y. V. Matiyasevich, R. K. Guy, A new formula for π, Amer. Math. Monthly **93** (1986), 631–635.

[14] P. Ribenboim, Square Classes of Fibonacci and Lucas Numbers, Portugal. Math. **46** (1989), 159–175.

[15] P. Sarnak, Equidistribution and primes, Pacific Institute for the Mathematical Sciences lecture, Vancouver (2007), available at `http://www.math.princeton.edu/sarnak/EquidPrimcs.pdf`.

[16] A. Schinzel, Primitive divisors of the expression $A^n - B^n$ in algebraic number fields, J. Reine angew. Math. **268/269** (1974), 27–33.

[17] Z.-H. Sun, Z.-W. Sun, Fibonacci numbers and Fermat's last theorem. Acta Arith. **60** (1992), 371–388.

[18] D. Wall, Fibonacci series modulo m, Amer. Math. Monthly **67** (1960), 525–532.

[19] O. Wyler, Solution of advanced problem 5080, Amer. Math. Monthly **71** (1964), 220–222.